Southwest, and manifested at all times the true spirit of the zealous missionary.

Dueling. —Dueling originated in the dark ages. Historically considered it presents itself in two phases. The first, in order of time, was "the wager of battle;" the second, the trial in single combat, outside of courts, which has come down to us of the present day known as the duel proper, with its governing code. In its first phase, the wager of battle or judicial duel, the custom was brought into Europe by the barbarian tribes of the North, who overthrew the Roman Empire. Under this system all controversies brought into open court were settled by single combat with sword and lance. The party who proved victorious in the combat was declared innocent and acquitted; if defeated he was pronounced guilty and punished in accordance with the penalty prescribed for the offense. It was no uncommon thing for the judge to be challenged for his decision or assassinated on the bench. Yet in France this barbarous system became a part of its jurisprudence. In England the judicial duel was introduced after the Norman conquest, and, as in France, became obsolete when an attempt was made to revive and graft it on the American colonies just preceding the Revolution by the British ministry. This offshoot of a barbarous age could not survive modern enlightenment, but its twin relic of barbarism, the modern duel, survives and still maintains a foothold in most European countries, in the United States and Mexico. The duel by single combat, with its system of challenges, seconds and codes, was an outgrowth of the judicial combat. Its growth was fostered by the spirit of chivalry and knight-errantry which caused men to go to all lengths in defense of their honor or that of the ladies whose protection they assumed. A sanction was given to dueling in 1528 by the celebrated cartel that Francis I of France sent to the Emperor Charles V of Germany. Previous to this challenges were sent and duels fought by individuals for causes not allowed under judicial combat. Under that sanction gentlemen of rank were induced, by affront and injuries, to resort to the sword, and it is admitted that modern dueling, with its code of rules, dates from this period. After this cartel duels on account of private injuries became common in France. Every man of rank thought himself entitled to draw his sword for every affront that touched his honor. In England, after the introduction of the institution of chivalry, the arrogant barons and gentlemen of rank appealed to the sword to redress their real or imaginary wrongs. In Ireland the mania prevailed at about the period of the union with England, when political duels became frequent. Ireland has the credit—or discredit—of formulating what is known as the "Galway articles" for the conduct of and rules governing duels, which may be found published at length by Sabine. These rules declare that a blow and the lie direct are the two greatest offenses; that no reconciliation can take place until after two discharges by each of the parties or a severe hit, after which B may ask A's pardon for the blow. Then A may explain simply for the lie, for a blow is never allowable, and the offense of the lie therefore merges in it. One of the rules declares that no apology can be received after the parties have actually taken their ground without exchange of fires. Rule 17 of this code allows the challenged party to choose the ground, the challenger to choose the distance, while the seconds fix the time and the terms of firing. Some variations have doubtless superseded this iron-clad code, but in the main it gives a good idea of modern dueling. In the German Universities the absurd custom has long been indulged in by the students, who usually fought with broad-swords. In our own country the eastern colonies of North America were settled much about the same time as those by the cavaliers in Virginia, the Dutch in New York and the Puritans in New England, then called North Virginia. Yet nearly a hundred years elapsed before any records were made of the gentlemanly custom of dueling. The first duel fought within the present limits of the United States is accredited to New England in 1621, the year after its first settlement. The parties in this affair of honor were Edward Doty and Edward Leister, servants of Stephen Hopkins. The weapons were sword and dagger. Both were wounded. There being no statute law against dueling, the Puritan fathers met in assembly and, after seizing the parties, decided that they had committed an ungodly crime against the good order of society, and therefore condemned them to be tied together, hand and foot, and to abstain from food and drink twenty-four hours. After this New England

and the American colonies generally were exempt from dueling until it was revived during the Revolutionary War. After the war for independence numerous duels were fought in the United States between men prominent in public life, and Weehawken, near Hoboken, New Jersey, and Blandensburg, near Washington, D. C., became famous eastern dueling grounds. Later public sentiment and legislation combined to drive the custom from the Northern States and to confine its observances mainly to the Southern States. Since the Civil War the same causes have operated to bring about its suppression in the South. In the West we must associate Missouri and Illinois together as common ground in writing of duels and dueling. Of French origin, the inhabitants on both sides of the Mississippi were substantially the same in sentiment, language and religion. The barbarous custom of dueling was unknown among the primitive settlers in this region. But in after times, when immigration flowed in from the East, bringing with it a higher civilization, with its perverted moral notions, including the pernicious practice above indicated, the innocent condition of a happy community soon changed. Dueling gradually came into vogue, and, as will be seen, Illinois, in addition to having been the friendly asylum in times of peril and alarm, became the dueling ground for citizens of St. Louis. Preliminary to an account of duels fought on Bloody Island, and associated with the history of St. Louis, it may be mentioned that the first duel in Illinois of which there is any record was fought at the time when the British took possession of Fort Chartres. Two young officers, one French and the other English, had a quarrel on account of a lady. They fought with small swords. One was killed: the survivor fled. The names of the combatants have not been preserved. A duel is referred to in John Reynolds' History of Illinois as having taken place between two Northwestern traders, Crawford and Campbell by name, but the date and the precise location are not in evidence. The affair is spoken of as so uncalled-for and brutal that it arrested for a time this cruel mode of settling disputes. About the year 1801 a duel was fought on an island in the Mississippi near Ste. Genevieve between Rice Jones and Shadrach Bond, the first Governor-elect of Illinois. Jones was the son of John Rice Jones, a prominent official of the Territorial and State government of Missouri, who lived, and died in St. Louis in 1824. Party spirit raged high at Kaskaskia, where young Jones practiced law. A controversy growing out of this state of things resulted in a duel between him and Bond. They met and when about to open fire Jones' pistol, having a hair trigger, went off by accident. Dunlap, the second of Bond, claimed that it was Jones' fire, and that Bond in return might fire at Jones. But Bond, believing it to have been an accident, reserved his fire, and the controversy was settled on honorable terms. Dunlap then took up the quarrel until, in the most cowardly manner, he shot Jones in the public streets of Kaskaskia. The murderer escaped to Texas and was never brought before the courts for the crime. In October, 1811, a duel was fought on Moreau Island, below Ste. Genevieve, between Thomas H. Crittenden—brother of John J. Crittenden—and Dr. Walter Fenwick, both residents of Ste. Genevieve. At the first fire Dr. Fenwick fell mortally wounded. General Henry Dodge and Honorable John Scott were the seconds.

A reason given by Mr. Robert A. Tryon, in his History of East St. Louis, and by others, for the selection of Bloody Island as a dueling ground is because the island was not definitely located for some years in either Missouri or Illinois. It thereupon afforded for some years a secluded resort for the settlement of personal disputes and an appeal to the code of honor. The island was covered with trees and a thick undergrowth, affording a retired spot—a sort of neutral ground, shielded from the public view and the intrusion of public and other officials, whose distance was too remote to watch and arrest the offenders. The first recorded duel on this famous spot was fought between Thomas H. Benton, subsequently United States Senator, and Charles H. Lucas, both practicing lawyers, the latter United States Attorney of Missouri at the time. Concurrent accounts state that the duel grew out of a trial in which they were engaged, provoked by reproachful language toward each other and aggravated in a controversy at a political meeting, when Lucas challenged Benton's vote, the latter calling Lucas "an insolent puppy." After the trial the first challenge was sent by Colonel Benton to Lucas, which was very properly declined by the latter on the ground that he was not accountable for words used in professional debate. After

the political encounter alluded to it appears that Lucas, smarting under the opprobrious epithet applied to him by Benton, thought it became his turn to challenge the latter. Colonel Benton accepted and the parties met on Bloody Island on the 12th of September, 1817. As a result of the first fire Lucas received a severe wound in the neck, and, owing to the effusion of blood, he was withdrawn from the field by his surgeon. It appears that a temporary reconciliation took place through the intervention of friends, but, the quarrel breaking out afresh, the parties again repaired to Bloody Island, not satisfied with the first meeting. They met on the 27th of September in the same year. The combat proved fatal to Lucas, and he fell, at the age of twenty-five, deeply lamented by his family and friends. Among the traditions which have been preserved regarding this fatal combat it is said that both pistols were fired so simultaneously that those who heard the report thought that there had been but one shot. An incident that occurred some time previously, not at all connected with the duel, but as showing the fearlessness of Lucas and his readiness to respond to the call of honor, may be related in this connection. During the time when Honorable John Scott was running as a candidate for Congress there appeared severe strictures on his course in the St. Louis "Gazette," written by various correspondents. He demanded of the editor, Mr. Charless, the names of the authors, which were given. Scott thereupon challenged to mortal combat five of these correspondents. Among them were Rufus Easton, Charles Lucas, Dr. Simpson and two others. They all declined with the exception of Lucas, but through the intervention of friends the difficulty was compromised. The reply of Easton to Scott's challenge, though a little out of place in this connection, was sensible and deserves preservation. He answered: "I do not want to kill you, and if you were to kill me I would die as the fool dieth." The second duel on Bloody Island, of which but meagre accounts are preserved, occurred between Captain Ramsay and Captain Martin, both officers of the United States Army, stationed at cantonment Bellefontaine, on the Missouri River. Ramsay was wounded and died a few days afterward. He was buried with Masonic and military honors. The third duel took place on the 30th of June, 1818, between Joshua Barton, United States district attorney, and Thomas C. Rector, both residents of St. Louis. The Rectors were a remarkable family, composed of nine brothers and four sisters, born in Virginia. In 1806 the brothers removed to Kaskaskia, reaching there when a survey of United States lands commenced. This was their opportunity. The whole family were strangers to fear, and an insult to any one of them never went unpunished. In the War of 1812 they were ready to shed their blood in defense of their country, and several of them held high positions in the United States Army. In 1818 General William Rector was appointed surveyor-general of Illinois, Missouri and Arkansas. He made St. Louis his residence, where the whole family also gathered and resided. While the General was in Washington an article appeared in the "Missouri Republican" charging him with corruption in office. The Rectors at once espoused the cause of their elder brother. The younger brother, Thomas C. Rector, on learning from the editor the name of the accuser, at once sent a challenge to Mr. Barton, who, brave and fearless of consequences, did not disavow being the author of the charge. The challenge was accepted. The parties met in the evening in the secluded shades of Bloody Island on June 30, 1818. At the first fire Barton fell and died soon afterward. The fourth most notable duel on the island was fought between Major Thomas Biddle, paymaster of the United States Army, and Honorable Spencer Pettis, a member of Congress. Major Biddle belonged to a family distinguished in the service of their country. His father, Major Biddle, a leading patriot of the Revolution, was chairman of the committee of defense and vice-president of Pennsylvania under the presidency of Dr. Franklin. His brother, Commodore James Biddle, of the United States Navy, won early distinction in the harbor of Tripoli. Another brother, Nicholas Biddle, became an eminent financier, while Thomas and John, both majors, served with distinction under Winfield Scott on the Niagara frontier. Pettis, in his canvass for re-election to Congress, made charges against Nicholas Biddle, then president of the United States Bank. On account of this Major Biddle was quite naturally deeply incensed. He decided to cowhide Mr. Pettis, a gross insult that would compel most any man of spirit to respond with a challenge. Major Biddle went

to work very deliberately to accomplish his purpose. Pettis had just returned from his canvass in the interior of the State. He was suffering from a bilious attack and repaired to his lodgings at the City Hotel. Major Biddle, armed with a rawhide whip, entered the sick man's room and lifting up the sheet that covered him with one hand, with the other applied the whip. After he recovered his health, and also after the election, which returned him to Congress, Pettis sent Biddle a challenge, which was accepted. They met on the island at 5 o'clock on Friday afternoon August 27, 1831. Biddle, being the challenged party, had the choice of distance. He fixed it at five feet on account of short-sightedness. Their weapons, when in position, actually overlapped each other. They stood back to back, facing outwardly, with pistols ready. At the signal given, "One! two! three!" both wheeled and fired. In such close proximity both were shot and mortally wounded. Both acted with remarkable bravery, and both forgave each other for affronts received in the past. The wounded men were brought over to the Missouri shore, where they were seen by many citizens as they were lifted from the boats. Pettis died the next day and was buried on Sunday, the day after. Biddle lived until Monday, the day after Pettis' funeral, when he died, and was buried on the next Wednesday by his old military associates at Jefferson Barracks with the honors of war. In anticipation of the duel Pettis filed a sworn statement of the facts leading up to it, and, upon the advice of Thomas Benton, postponed the sending of a challenge until after the election. Both men were placed under peace bonds by a local justice of the peace some time before their fatal meeting. An account of a meeting between Waddell and Mitchell, in which Waddell fell, is only rescued from oblivion by meagre traditional accounts. Probably the last duel on the island was fought between General D. M. Frost and Edward B. Sayers, the latter a civil engineer who laid out Camp Jackson. On the return of General Frost from the Southwest expedition in 1860 Sayers severely criticised his conduct. Frost thereupon horsewhipped Sayers in the latter's office, on Chestnut, between Main and Second Streets. Sayers then challenged Frost and they met on Bloody Island. Sayers was nervous and his fire missed. Frost then magnanimously fired his pistol in the air.

Other encounters took place on Bloody Island during its existence as a dueling ground, but the parties being comparatively unknown and not of sufficient importance to attract attention, history is silent concerning them and tradition has not preserved the particulars.

The first and last duel between citizens of Illinois was fought in Belleville, St. Clair County, in 1820. The parties were Alphonse Stewart and William Bennett. As made up between the seconds, it was to be a sham duel, with Stewart in the secret. Bennett, suspecting the trick, slyly dropped a ball into the barrel of his pistol. Stewart, as a consequence, fell mortally wounded. Bennett was convicted of murder. Governor Bond would not yield to efforts made to secure his pardon, and Bennett was hanged in the presence of a great multitude. It is stated in a late work on duels that Bennett is the only man who has been executed for taking the life of a fellow-man in a duel since we have become a free people. In all the States of the Union, as well as in England, killing in a duel is murder, but here, as well as there, opinion is superior to law. In some of the States the parties have seldom ever been held to answer; in others the inquiries in the courts have been confined to the single question of the fairness of the fight, and, this point determined in favor of the survivor, acquittal has followed as a matter of course. In writing of hostile meetings between prominent citizens of St. Louis, the affair between Thomas C. Reynolds and B. Gratz Brown in 1857 must not be passed over. Both have held offices of distinction in the State since that time. The quarrel grew out of personal attacks in the newspapers. Reynolds sent the first challenge to Brown, and the latter fixed the terms of meeting with rifles at sixty paces. Reynolds objected on account of nearsightedness, and kept on attacking Brown until the latter challenged Reynolds. As the challenged party he chose pistols at ten paces. Reynolds became fearful of arrest, in which case cowardice would be imputed to him as having willingly encouraged it to avoid the combat. He therefore concealed himself in the house of Mr. Isaac H. Sturgeon for several days. The parties met at sunrise on the Illinois side, opposite to Selma, about fifty miles below St. Louis. Reynolds' seconds were Ferdinand Kennett and Captain Thomas B. Hudson, with David H. Armstrong and

The Southern History Co

Engd by Williams N.Y.

Louis Dunstrow

Isaac H. Sturgeon as advisors. The seconds of Brown were Colonel Robert M. Rennick and Colonel D. D. Mitchell. Brown was wounded in the leg between the ankle and knee. Reynolds escaped unhurt. The duel between General Lucien M. Walker and General John S. Marmaduke should also be mentioned here, as the latter was a citizen of St. Louis and died while Governor of Missouri. It took place on a sandbar below Little Rock in 1863. Walker was in command of the Confederate Cavalry, and Marmaduke in command of a division. The occasion which led to the meeting was this: Colonel John Bull, while in command of a brigade, was sorely pressed by the Federal forces under General Steele. Colonel Bull sent an urgent request for re-enforcement to General Marmaduke. The latter called General Walker to his headquarters and requested him to issue the order, as the chief officer in command. Walker declined the responsibility. Hot words ensued, when Marmaduke denounced Walker as a coward. This led to a challenge and a hostile meeting at the place as above stated. The encounter was of the most deadly character. As agreed upon, the parties were to stand ten paces apart, back to back, facing outward, and at the signal to wheel about and, advancing toward each other, to fire until their revolvers were emptied. Walker fell mortally wounded on the second fire. Some years after the Civil War a hostile meeting which attracted some attention took place between two St. Louis journalists, Major John N. Edwards and Major Emory Foster. The difficulty was occasioned by the indiscreet but well meant action of a fair committee of Winnebago, Illinois, inviting the Confederate ex-President, Jefferson Davis, to deliver the address. The invitation was accepted, but owing to the opposition manifested, the engagement was cancelled by the Winnebago committee. This led to the publication of some newspaper articles in denunciation and defense of the Winnebago people by the St. Louis journalists. A challenge followed, and the parties met in Winnebago to settle the dispute by the code of honor. The seconds were Colonel Harrison Branch and Colonel W. D. W. Barnard; the surgeons, Dr. Morrison Munford and Dr. P. S. O'Reilly. After the exchange of one shot, without effect —said to have been a "high line shot"—the parties became reconciled and left the field in haste. Indictments were pending and extradition papers forthcoming, but through the influence brought to bear upon Governor Beveridge were not issued. St. Louis has also had among her well-known citizens some who bore painful evidence of their compliance with the code. The Honorable Jerry Clemens, an ex-member of Congress, wounded in a Southern duel, carried the evidence in his incurable lameness forever after. Colonel Samuel Lowe still carries in his leg a bullet that struck him in a duel fought in Maryland while quite a young man. The bullet is buried in a muscle and can be plainly felt, yet no surgeon would recommend its removal. General John Bull was once a principal in an affair of honor, and has no objections to being quoted as an apologist for and in favor of the dueling code, when conducted in accordance with the rules recognized by gentlemen. General McKinstry, who was a principal and the second in several noted duels in the unsettled and stormy days of early California history, believes also that the fear of an appeal to the code has a tendency to repress crime and vulgar insolence and insult toward the moral and virtuous in society.

WILLIAM FAYEL.

Duestrow, Louis, was born in the city of Mayence, Germany, July 16, 1832, and died in St. Louis, March 7, 1892. His father, William Duestrow, who was proprietor of a restaurant and store in Mayence, came to this country in 1849, bringing his family with him, and locating in St. Louis. It was the year of the cholera, when so many thousands died in our city, and Mr. Duestrow was one of them. His wife, the mother of Louis Duestrow, survived the epidemic and lived until November 12, 1880, dying at the ripe age of eighty-one years. Louis Duestrow, when a boy, attended the gymnasium in his native city of Mayence, and thus secured the benefit of the thorough schooling and discipline given at these places of instruction; and it was to this training, together with the aptitude for business inherited from his father, that he was largely indebted for his success in life. His first service was as clerk in the general store of Mr. Taussig, on Carondelet Avenue, and his next was in business for himself—a retail grocery store on Second Street, near Poplar. In 1857, when a young man twenty-five years of age, he was employed as clerk of the Franklin Fire Insurance Company of St. Louis, and exhibited so high a capacity for the business that, upon